

Dear Jim, Tad Szulc/Star/ & series 9/19/75 TT HW 9/19/75

I did not have much time to think after you phoned today to tell me of this first of a three-part series this featuring the transcripts. I did, off the top, as usual, write the editor of the Star (cc with note to Ben Bradlee). Long ago I had agreed to a visit from an ex UPI reporter now with a trade publication when he was in the area, which turned out to be today and for supper. Tomorrow there will be at least one and perhaps two guests, also agreed to earlier. So, I'm not getting the work I wanted to done and I'm not having time to think about your call.

However, it occurred to me after our guest left with what I hope is enough time to make the last NYC shuttle, it came back to me that you mentioned Nosenko in your call. This may be a giveaway. I think but ^{through} ~~maybe~~ my anger can't be sure that I mentioned the possibilities to you when we spoke.

Now I don't know of anyone else who has been pushing both the CIA and the Archives on Nosenko. It began verbally before I was taken ill in April. The day we had the first cugstone pic taken Johnson gave me a partial file that since I have kept separate. In and of itself it is a deliberate withholding of what then was no longer withheld. Then there was correspondence. Then I got some of what had not been given to me.

I raised questions close to immediately and in writing. The Archives told me it had been referred to the CIA. It violated the law in not saying it would need more time within the time permitted. The Archives, in fact, made the same violation, as I think I wrote earlier, in not even referring that request in time.

In all this time I have had nothing from the CIA.

Now, suddenly, out of the nothingness of his non-interest in the Warren Report, Szulc develops this interest in Nosenko?

ONLY after I appeal the denials some of which were plain stonewalling (the others far nicer stonewalling) Szulc develops an interest and from what I gather in nothing in all this vastness of material except that on which I've been working? Nosenko and "my" transcripts?"

Do we want to ask Lloyds of London what the odds really are?

What would seem to be obvious is that someone is feeding Szulc.

How many people can know this story and that I'm after the withheld and its meaning?

(I had a short chapter on this in PM and Howard took all or almost all of it out!)

This whole thing is of the Angleton wing of the CIA. That is, with the Commission.

Szulc seems to speak for the non-Angleton wing and now both are in trouble.

Until I read the series all I can say is that the coincidences, if this they are, are truly remarkable.

I think that if we had support and experienced, perhaps partly retired counsel, we could develop one hell of a thing from these indications and the past record.

I can, of course, file any time with the CIA having violated the law when these two requests were referred to them. But we haven't the time now.

And now, of course, if they give anything to me they have to give it to this Johnny-come-lately Szulc.

What remarkable coincidences we live through!

Best,